

2
STRICTURES .

ON THE

REV. W. MASON'S EARNEST ADDRESS

TO THE

MEMBERS OF THE NEW CHURCH

IN GREAT BRITAIN AND AMERICA,

ON A

SUBJECT OF PARAMOUNT IMPORTANCE CONNECTED WITH THE
PROJECTED CENTENARY CELEBRATION IN 1857.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM BRUCE.

LONDON :

WILLIAM WHITE, 36, BLOOMSBURY STREET.

J. S. HODSON, 22, PORTUGAL STREET, LINCOLN'S INN.

1856.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

STRICTURES

ON THE

REV. W. MASON'S EARNEST ADDRESS

TO THE

MEMBERS OF THE NEW CHURCH

IN GREAT BRITAIN AND AMERICA,

ON A

SUBJECT OF PARAMOUNT IMPORTANCE CONNECTED WITH THE
PROJECTED CENTENARY CELEBRATION IN 1857.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM BRUCE.

LONDON :

WILLIAM WHITE, 36, BLOOMSBURY STREET.

1856.

LONDON :
PRINTED BY WALTON AND MITCHELL,
WARDOUR STREET.

STRICTURES,

ETC.

THE doctrine of the Lord's New Church teaches us, that Jehovah assumed and glorified human nature for the purpose of accomplishing the redemption and providing for the salvation of mankind, and that God in his Divine Humanity is the only Object of human worship. I have been accustomed to consider this as all that is essential to be known and acknowledged on this subject by the members of the New Jerusalem. I had been encouraged in this belief by the teaching and conduct of the venerated Clowes himself, whom Mr. Mason so justly admires, and the advocate of whose views he avows himself to be. In a letter to the editors of the *Intellectual Repository*, who, in reviewing his work on the Miracles, had expressed their dissent from his views on the subject of the Lord's Glorification, as given in his explanation of the Lord's Resurrection, after expressing how ardently he wished that the editors' views and his own were more in accord with each other, he concludes in these words: "Much however as I lament that, in this instance, the children of the New Dispensation cannot be brought to think exactly alike, yet I am consoled with the reflection, that the difference of their opinion *does not affect the real truth of that dispensation, neither has it a tendency to diminish the influence of that substantial truth on the minds and lives of those who receive the dispensation.* For whether we say that the material body of the Lord was glorified, or not, *we all agree in this*, that He now reigns in heaven in a DIVINE

SUBSTANTIAL BODY, OR HUMANITY, and in that BODY, OR HUMANITY, is the ONE ONLY TRUE AND LIVING GOD,—the ONE ONLY DIVINE FOUNTAIN OF ALL LIFE, LOVE, WISDOM, AND BENEDICTION; thus the CREATOR, PRESERVER, REDEEMER, REGENERATOR, and SAVIOUR of mankind and of all the host of heaven; consequently, the ALPHA AND OMEGA, the BEGINNING AND THE ENDING, WHICH WAS, AND WHICH IS, AND WHICH IS TO COME, THE ALMIGHTY.”

But we now learn, that when that excellent man was thus extending what he supposed to be the olive-branch of peace over the church he so much loved, and whose unity and harmony he so much desired, he was only stretching out the magician’s wand to cast its members into the profound slumber of a false and dangerous security. From that state, with its pleasing but delusive dreams of essential concord and unity, we are now to be awakened. Mr. Mason has resolved to send fire and a sword into the church. The sword is already unsheathed; the fire is already kindled. It will no longer avail us that we believe and worship, however sincerely, the Lord Jesus Christ as Jehovah in a glorified human form. This of itself is not enough. We must not only believe that the Lord’s humanity was glorified and is now divine, we must also believe that it was glorified and made divine in the particular manner in which Mr. Mason is pleased to dictate; and if we do not submit to this dictation, we are not only to be branded as heretics, but to be cut off as unbelievers. To all who hold the view he opposes, Mr. Mason has but one declaration to make, “then you cannot, in fact, believe the testimony of the Word to the Lord’s Resurrection” (p. 24). And if they do, in fact, deny that Christ is risen, what more correct than the verdict, “Your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins?” and then, what more just than the sentence, that they be cut off from having any claim to be, in fact, Christians at all?

Aware of the magnitude of this work of purification and separation, Mr. Mason has already set up, and now invites, to his standard all who are like-minded with himself. Those

who come forward are to be enrolled as members of a sacred Association, which is to labor indefatigably in purifying the church from the great heresy. Its members are to instruct the ignorant and confirm the wavering. A council is to sit to deliberate on the means of promoting and securing the important object, and to carry it out in a way already determined on. They are to answer those who respectfully ask ready-made questions, but to cut at once all impertinent inquirers and troublesome objectors; thus separating the chaff from the wheat, and sifting the church of its heretical members.

But Mr. Mason's desires extend beyond even this. He wishes the General Conference to establish the truth of his theory, as the Council of Nice established the truth of the Athanasian Creed, by a majority of votes: and when this is done, a clause is to be introduced into the Ordination Service, which will effectually shut the door against the admission into the ministry of any one who does not avow his belief in this new article of faith.

Mr. Mason hopes to have accomplished his reformation, or rather revolution, before the Great Meeting proposed to be held in 1857, to celebrate the first centenary of the New Dispensation. Otherwise, what will *The Times* newspaper say about us? Will it not send its thunder among us, even perhaps while we are yet assembled, and scatter us as a set of fanatics, who thrust ourselves upon public attention as the possessors of a religious system that is to regenerate and harmonize the world, while we ourselves are in a state of the greatest discord and confusion on one of the most essential points of our creed?

Even supposing the theory of the Lord's Glorification put forth in the pamphlet to be the true one, is not all this a grave offence against the doctrine of charity? Does not that doctrine teach, that when charity is practically recognized as primary, the church is one, notwithstanding there may be difference of opinion on matters of faith? Is the unity of the church to be destroyed, or even its harmony to be disturbed, on a subject which is admitted to be the

profoundest that can engage the minds even of angels, and on which conscientious and even enlightened men may surely be pardoned if they find themselves unable to arrive at the same conclusion? But since Mr. Mason, unprovoked by opposition, has again forced his favorite theory on the attention of the church, it is not unreasonable that those who differ from him in opinion should desire also to be heard, that those members whose time and pursuits do not enable them to enter into an independent investigation of the subject, may have something on both sides of the question which may better enable them to form a correct opinion.

The two views entertained in the church on the subject of the Lord's Glorification have points of argument, and of difference. Both agree, in terms at least, that the glorification was effected by the Lord putting off the infirm humanity he inherited from the Mother, and putting on a Divine Humanity derived from the Father, and, that the glorification was a progressive work, which continued during the whole period the Lord was in the world. They differ, however, both as to the subject and of the process, and as to the time at which it was completed. According to one view, the Lord received from the Mother both a mental and bodily inheritance; and that he fully completed on the cross the glorification of all he inherited from the Mother, except the maternal body, which he put off or dissipated in the sepulchre, putting on in its place a purely Divine body, in which he rose from the dead. According to Mr. Mason, the Lord took nothing from the Virgin but the body; this, consequently, was the only subject of glorification, which work was fully accomplished, and the Lord's body was wholly Divine, when on the cross he exclaimed, "It is finished."

This is the point which is most strongly insisted on in the pamphlet, and which forms its principal theme. I shall therefore first submit this particular to examination.

If the Lord's exclamation on the cross, "It is finished," could be justly insisted on as implying that the work of glorification was then so fully completed, so as to exclude the pre-

sence of any "residue from the mother," might it not be maintained that the glorification was fully completed even before the crucifixion? since the Lord, in his prayer to the Father, as accorded in the seventeenth chapter of John, declares, "I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do." At the time these words were uttered, neither redemption nor glorification was wholly completed; and to say that the latest declaration implies the complete glorification of the Lord, even to the deification of his body, is to strain the language beyond its natural import and intention.

Had the Lord's body been made wholly Divine upon the cross, it could not have been subject to death. How could a Divine body die? Had his humanity been completely glorified when he uttered his exclamation on the cross, that which proved the moment of his death would have been the moment of his entering into new and Divine life. If we may so express it, the moment of his death would have been that of his resurrection. At that very instant would he have quitted the cross, full of life and immortality, having all power in heaven and on earth. Instead of this, what do we behold? On Mr. Mason's theory, we see a Divine body remaining suspended on a material cross, upheld and prevented from falling to the earth by the material nails with which it is transfixed: we see a Divine body pierced with a material spear, and sending through the wound a stream of material blood and water: we see a Divine Body taken down from the cross by the rude and material hands of Roman soldiers, who go through all the process of withdrawing the nails before they can separate the body from the tree: we see this Divine Body transferred to the gentler but not less material hands of the Lord's weeping disciples; by them embalmed with material spices and wrapped in material linen, and finally carried to and laid in a material sepulchre; and there, in the house of death, lies the Divine Body of the Most High—a corpse, pale, senseless, motionless as death itself!

May we not appeal to angels and men, and say, Beheld ye

ever any spectacle like this ! Look, ye bright ones, into the darkest chambers of the human mind ; search, ye holy ones, into the most superstitious corners of the earth, and tell if ye can find the trace of any imagination of the heart of fallen man so supremely preposterous, so utterly revolting !

But Mr. Mason offers an explanation of the Lord's death, and of his remaining for some time in the state of the dead. Swedenborg informs us that the Lord made his Humanity Divine Truth when He was in the world, and that He made it Divine Good after He went out of the world. Mr. Mason considers that the process by which the Lord made his Humanity Divine Truth was completed when the Lord declared on the cross, "It is finished;" but that the process by which He made his Humanity Divine Good did not commence till He had risen from the dead. Between his death and resurrection "a middle or transition state existed,—always a state of great mystery." The Humanity "had been made *Divine Truth* in the world, but the *Divine Good* was indrawn ; apparently the *Father had forsaken the Son.*" Truth without good being without life ; when the Divine Good was indrawn, and appeared to be absent, the Lord's Humanity was, or appeared to be, dead. To this I object, and I believe my objection will be almost universally admitted to be a sound one, that it is utterly impossible that Divine Good can be indrawn, or appear to be absent, even for an instant, from essential Divine Truth.

If the Humanity even to the very ultimates was then life itself, how could life so much as appear to be absent from it ? Is it not a manifest contradiction in terms to say, that life was indrawn from life ? that life appeared to be absent from life ? that life itself could even seem to die, when the Lord said, "It is finished?" If "his whole ultimate organism stood in the infinitely perfect image of his Eternal Deity," what "remained to be done for his glorious resurrection?" Was not the Humanity already fit for the Divinity to enter into it ? Would not Jehovah, at that very instant, have taken full possession of the temple of his glory ?

But the difficulties and absurdities of the theory do not end here. Happily none of the others are so intensely painful as that which presents the idea of a Divine Body under the dominion of Death and the Grave. On the contrary, that which we now come to consider is of such a character as to lighten or remove the load that oppresses our spirits after witnessing so dreadful and unnatural a tragedy.

Strongly as he is opposed to the "dissipationists," the author yet admits that there was somewhat dissipated in the sepulchre. Can the reader imagine what this somewhat was? Admitting, what he could not well deny, that the Lord's "body when taken down from the cross had the material attributes (notwithstanding the Divinity of its ultimate organical forms) of weight and size," he tells us that these were dissipated in the sepulchre. But to mark the great difference between his views and the notion of those who maintain that the matter, as well as the material attributes, of the Lord's body was put off in the tomb, he exclaims, giving emphasis to his assertion by his own peculiar mode of printing, "That was ALL that was dissipated:" merely weight and size; nothing more. Let us look at this singular assertion, and see what it contains. Here we have four very wonderful things. We have, first, the material attributes of weight and size without any material substance as a basis; second, we have, or ought to have, somewhere, a quantity of matter—that to which these attributes once belonged—without either size or weight; third, we have these material attributes rejected by, or having rejected, their own proper, material subject, adhering to a new and purely divine object, between whose nature and their own there is nothing in common, but an infinite distance; and last, we have these material attributes cast off as unworthy of their new connection, and finally dissipated.

Is not all this very surprising? May we ask, How did the matter and its attributes come to be separated? If the matter was changed into something else, why were not its attributes changed also and at the same time? If the matter

was removed, how did it leave its attributes behind it? Would it be inquiring too curiously to ask further, if, when both were removed, the matter and its attributes ever met again? If they did, how they would rush into each other's arms, having been united in the closest union since the first moment of their existence, and that is so long ago as the beginning of the creation! But, on second thoughts, how could they meet? For would not the matter, divested of its weight, ascend? and would not the weight, more heavy without the buoyant matter, descend? Thus it would seem, that by the new condition of their being, they must for ever remain at the greatest possible distance from each other. Pity the author of this refined subtilty did not live in the days of the schoolmen, or in connection with the Romish church! Then, had he been pleased to say, which he might have said with as much truth and soberness, that the size and weight of the Lord's body were left, instead of being dissipated, in the sepulchre, we might to-day have found these abstractions, placed as precious relics in some holy shrine, objects of the devout homage of crowds of pious pilgrims. But the age of philosophical and theological romance is now, we hope, gone by. People—at least those of the New Church—do not look through the priest's eyes, but into them, to see what signs of intelligence they display, to compare the priestly perceptions with their own, and judge for themselves. And we cannot doubt that in this instance they will judge rightly. What would the dreaded *Times* say to this fancy? Possibly it would call it a piece of Swedenborgian jargon or mysticism. But whatever it might say, its thunder could not fall angrily on the head that could create it, nor even on a great gathering of people who might be supposed capable of believing it. Seriously, what must be the character of the system which could drive an otherwise intelligent and conscientious mind to seek refuge from the force of obvious truth in such a pitiable sophism as this? Baseless, indeed, must be the fabric, that can rest on so visionary a foundation.

But absurd and ludicrous as it is, in its present shape, the statement that the Lord's crucified body had material attributes is, after all, an important admission. It, in fact, settles the question. And if Mr. Mason is really desirous to see harmony and unity in the church on the subject of the Lord's Glorification, he may now attain this object by a simpler process, and in a much shorter time, than can have appeared to him in his most hopeful visions of success. In the statement he has made, he really grants all that those whose views he opposes ever believed or taught. In admitting that the Lord's resurrection body had the material attributes of weight and size, he, in fact, admits that it was material. What else could it be, if it were ponderable, measurable, tangible? And in admitting that the material attributes of the Lord's body were dissipated in the sepulchre, he, in fact, admits that the matter of the Lord's body was dissipated also. For who can conceive of material attributes where there is no matter? Henceforth his opponents may say to the author, this is not our teaching only, it is yours also. And you teach it not the less truly that you do not yourself believe it. For since you admit the premises, every one, not blinded by system, can draw the conclusion. No one will require to go through any process of reasoning to see to the end of the argument, nor need assistance from any one to arrive at the right conclusion. He will draw it instantly and unerringly for himself. He will conclude, and with as much certainty as truth, that what had material attributes could be nothing else but matter.

Although it is not necessary to the argument, it may place the truth and the error in greater contrast, to inquire what weight the Lord's body may be supposed to have had. For just in proportion as it had weight, is there reason to conclude that it contained matter. Just in proportion to the force with which it tended to the centre of the earth, must it have consisted of the substance of the earth. In the total absence of all allusion in the Gospels to any such circumstance as that of the Lord's body having an unusual levity, there is every reason to infer that in this respect there was no sensible dif-

ference between the body of our Lord and that of an ordinary man. And if so, there is reason further to conclude that it consisted of the same ponderable matter.

Mr. Mason has seen and anticipated some such objection as this. Probably, he says, some reader may exclaim, "Still I do not see how a body could be divine, and *not* material, while it could be handled in the same way as ordinary matter." What reply may such a doubting inquirer be expected to receive? "Very likely you may not see this," I reply, "for we are all too much influenced by appearances, which we cannot surmount without a considerable advancement in spiritual knowledge, and elevation of state by regeneration." Hence he concludes, "I do not know whether considerations that have weight with me will have the same weight with others." He then states the consideration already considered at p. 5. The "appearance," of which an explanation is there offered, is certainly a rather formidable one. But since considerable spiritual knowledge and experience are required to enable any one to surmount it, how loudly does this demand of those who have attained the necessary elevation, to have some kindly consideration for the want of perspicacity in their less advanced brethren; particularly when the point in dispute is not the fact itself of the Lord's Glorification, but only the manner in which it was accomplished.

Whilst the admitted presence in the Lord's crucified body of the material attribute of weight proves its materiality, the admitted attribute of size proves its finiteness. When Swedenborg states that the Lord's glorified body is not to be conceived of as being of any particular size, he only employs other words for saying that it is infinite—that it is in all space without space. What is finite is measurable; what is infinite is immeasurable. So long therefore as the Lord's body had size, and could be measured, so long it was of necessity finite.

Besides these evidences of the finiteness and materiality of the Lord's crucified body, which our friend admits as facts,

there are others not less conclusive. The Lord's body was an object of the sense of touch, and this it could not have been unless it had possessed the *substance* as well as the *weight* of matter—even supposing such a thing possible as a body having one without the other. The Lord's body was also seen by the material eye, and this was impossible unless it had possessed material *substance* as well as material *size*. To be perceptible to the sense of sight, a substance must reflect the rays of light which proceed from the sun of this world; and we know of no substance that can do this but matter. A spiritual substance cannot reflect the rays of natural light, much less can a divine substance; and this is the reason that they cannot be seen by the natural eye. So long therefore as the Lord's body could be seen by the material eye, it must have been material. In the absence of all proof to the contrary, we are authorized, nay, we are bound, farther to conclude that the Lord's body was, like all material bodies, sonorous—it had the quality of producing natural sound. When we pass one hand over the other, however lightly, we not only feel but we hear the effect produced by the friction. In the handling of the Lord's body; in its removal, embalmment, and burial, it must have produced those sounds which ever proceed from a material body in similar circumstances. While the Lord's body, to be handled, seen and heard, must have possessed all the mechanical properties of matter, we are bound to conclude that it likewise possessed the chemical properties which affect the senses of smell and taste. The Lord's body was no doubt odorous, which must have resulted from a sphere of material particles flowing from and surrounding its substance, and acting on the olfactory nerves; and had the tongue been applied to it, there is no reason to doubt that it would have affected the sense of taste.

In the absence of all proof to the contrary—in the absence of any allusion in the gospels to any such facts as that of the Lord's body differing sensibly in any one of these properties from the body of an ordinary man, we are bound to conclude

that it possessed them all. Unless, then, Mr. Mason can satisfactorily explain how these material properties could belong, even for one moment, to a purely Divine body, he must stand convicted, before every man of sound reason and common sense, of teaching the grossest absurdity that was ever attempted to be palmed upon the credulity of mankind.

We say nothing here of the dissipation of these material properties in the sepulchre. When he has succeeded in giving a satisfactory explanation of the first point, we will leave him in undisputed possession of the second as a well-merited reward for his triumph.

We now come to another portion of the evidence on this subject, one on which the author lays much stress, as affording decisive proof of the truth of his theory. It consists in the Lord's declaration to his disciples, after his resurrection, that a spirit has not flesh and bones as they saw Him have; in his shewing them his hands and his side; and in afterwards inviting Thomas to put his finger into the print of the nails, and thrust his hand into his side, and be not faithless but believing.

What evidence this affords in favour of any particular theory of the Lord's Glorification is not very clear. All acknowledge that the Lord had flesh and bones, and that his flesh and bones were divine. In other words, all admit that the Lord's Humanity was glorified even as to its sensual and corporeal principles. These were his flesh and bones. The author, however, seems to think that this proves the perfect identity as to substance of the Lord's crucified and of his risen body. For this purpose he maintains that the wounds which the Lord's body exhibited to the apostles were not apparent but real. In support of this he appeals to the testimony of the passages themselves, which he insists are to be understood in their plain literal sense. We do not need to inquire whether the spirit of the Word sanctions the idea that the wounds were real. We need only ask, whether the literal sense, explained by doctrine, or even regarded with common sense, teaches it. The doctrine which teaches us that the Lord's

body was divine, is sufficient to instruct us that it could have no actual wounds produced by material weapons. And the writings which teach us that "the Lord appears to every one according to his quality" (*A.C.*, 6831), enables us satisfactorily to account for the apparent existence of such marks of mortality in his glorified body. The wounds were accommodations to the states of those to whom they were exhibited. There is never, therefore, the slightest allusion to them, except on the two especial occasions when they were shewn for the express purpose of convincing the doubting disciples and the unbelieving Thomas, that He whom they saw was the Lord Himself. If we carefully examine the sacred narratives we shall find, not simply that the Lord's person and even his voice were so different after, from what they were before, his resurrection, that his disciples did not know Him, but that they varied with the occasion. Those who had seen Him and had come to know Him in his resurrection body, did not necessarily know Him when they saw Him again. These changes that took place in the appearance of the Lord's person cannot be accounted for on the ground that the Lord's body was undergoing an actual change, since it is recorded that at or about the same time He appeared first to Mary Magdalene, He appeared "in another form" to two of his disciples, as they walked into the country. So different were the Lord's appearance and voice after his resurrection, that Mary, familiar as she had been with both, thought He was the gardener, even after He had accosted her in the words of sympathy, "Woman, why weepest thou? whom seekest thou?" and knew Him not, till, for the purpose of making Himself known, He uttered her name. Can we fail to believe that "Mary" was pronounced with the tone which had become so endeared as well as familiar to that pure and loving saint, in her long and faithful attendance on her Lord and Saviour?

But as to the wounds. It is evident they were not seen by the two disciples with whom He journeyed to Emmaus. True, on that occasion, their eyes were holden that they should not know Him. Equally true is it that they saw

Him. They must have seen his feet while He walked with them, and they must have seen his hands while He talked with them by the way, and while He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself. But they saw no prints of nails in his hands or feet, or they would have recognized Him.

When the Lord appeared to the disciples at the sea of Tiberias, it is obvious that, although they saw the Lord's person for a considerable time, they perceived no wounds in his hands or feet; and though He conversed with them, they did not recognize Him. Yet they had before seen Him and heard Him, when He appeared in the midst of them, and shewed them his hands and his side. Nor was it till, in obedience to his request, they had let down the net on the right side of the ship and had caught a great multitude of fishes, that the conviction flashed upon their minds that it was the Lord. But not even then, it would seem, did they know Him but from an intuitive perception. And this perception appears to have been the only evidence they had that the Lord Himself was among them, after they had invited them to come and dine, and they had seen a supernatural fire kindled, and fish laid thereon, and bread. Still none durst ask Him who art thou, knowing it was the Lord. Would there have been any of this mysterious fear and silence had they seen his hands and feet with open wounds? Would they not have simultaneously and instantly acknowledged Him?

The author is not loath to accusing those who believe that the wounds were apparent, not real, of imputing to their Divine Lord the practice of the juggler's art, in shewing his disciples wounds which were not there. In the same spirit, and with equal truth, might it be urged that the Lord practised deception on his disciples when He shewed them his hands and his feet unmarked by wounds that were actually in them; and when He assumed an aspect and voice which were not his own.

But if the Lord's body had wounds after his resurrection, had it wounds after his ascension? Mr. Mason is not

quite decided upon this. He has no objection to the idea. He would not honor a brave defender of his country less because of his scars. Therefore he would not honor his Divine Saviour less were he sure that he retains his. But who that reflects on the subject unfettered by such a creed, will not come to a different conclusion? Who that attends to the difference between the Lord's crucified and his risen body—the body which died and was laid in the grave and the body that burst the fetters of the tomb on the resurrection morn—that appeared in the midst of his disciples, the doors being shut—that vanished in an instant, and that thus transcended all the conditions of time and space—will not confess, and rejoice in the confession, that the difference between the Lord's resurrection and his crucified body is just that which exists between the merely human and the divine, between finite and infinite? To suppose that the body with which the Lord rose from the dead and ascended into heaven, had actual wounds, is to suppose an impossibility.

We now come to another and still more important branch of the subject—one that will lead us to investigate some of the profoundest truths. We propose now to offer some remarks on the Assumption and Glorification of Humanity by the Lord, by which the Creator became the Redeemer and Saviour of the world. In this I shall not follow the author through all his minute reasoning. Some points of the argument I shall have to take up. But my principal aim will be to establish the view I have stated on general principles, such as may be apprehensible by every mind, and which, if sound, will form the best introduction to particular truths, and the best safeguard against particular errors.

If I have ever understood, or do now understand, any thing of the teaching of the Word, as explained in the writings of the church, on this sublime subject, the grand object of the Incarnation was to bring into ultimates that in the Deity which from eternity had existed only in first principles. On this subject we are thus taught in the Holy Scriptures :

“In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and God was the Word; and the Word was made flesh.” From this Divine declaration we are instructed in the writings of the church, that prior to the Incarnation the Lord had indeed been the Word, but the Word *in first principles*. By assuming human nature He became the Word *in ultimates also*. The same truth is expressed in different terms in other parts of the works. Of the three uncreate and infinite degrees which were in the Lord from eternity, the Divine Celestial and the Divine Spiritual existed actually, the Divine Natural only in potency, such as it is with angels. By Incarnation the third degree was made actual, such as it is with men.

Our friend objects to the view of this subject as I have stated it in my own words. He asserts that what once existed in first principles in the Divine Being must always exist so. Therefore he maintains it was necessary for the Lord to take upon Himself Humanity in the natural world, and to make that itself into a Divine ultimate, by which from first principles He might operate in the work of salvation.

The view which I have stated appears to me to be sound in principle. I consider that the real ultimate of a thing is the thing itself in ultimates. Thus action is the ultimate of will, speech is the ultimate of thought. In the will good exists potentially, in action it exists actually. In the will good exists in first principles, in action it exists in ultimates also. But action is nothing but the will acting, as speech is nothing but the thought speaking. The will produces action from itself, and is itself in action. When thus ultimated, the producing principle acquires actual and permanent existence. Apply this principle to the Incarnation. It is true that the Lord took upon Him from the Virgin an ultimate different in its nature from his own Eternal Word. But that which He took from Mary was not in itself the real and permanent ultimate of the Word. It was only the means by which the Divine was to form an ultimate suitable for Himself in the natural sphere of existence. By incarnation the Lord

was the begotten of God ; by glorification He became the born of God. By incarnation He was a man having in Him Divine seed ; by glorification He became a Divine Man. By incarnation the Lord had a Divine Father and a human mother ; by glorification He had a Divine Father and a divine mother. His glorified Humanity was born of Essential Divine Good as a Father, and of Essential Divine Truth as a mother. And a birth from such a marriage, what could it be but a Humanity Uncreate, Infinite, and Life itself? In agreement with this, it is declared in the doctrines of the church that the Lord put off the infirm humanity He had from the mother and put on a Divine Humanity derived from the Father. The Humanity thus put on from the Father was truly the Word in ultimates—that very Word which had existed from eternity in first principles.

This, it appears to me, is a general statement of the truth on this subject, as delivered in the Word and explained in the writings. And having stated these general views, I now proceed to shew their soundness in a more particular consideration of the subject. In doing this, there are four points which seem to require our attention. What did the Lord take from the mother? what did He glorify? how was the glorification effected? when was it completed?

1. Every reader of Swedenborg is aware of his often repeated statement, that, like every other man, the Lord had his soul from the Father and his body from the mother. Soul and body constitute the whole nature of man. But these comprehend many particulars ; and as reference will be made to human nature under some of its minuter distinctions, it may be as well to mention them here. We are to recollect that there is an analogy between individual man, the Grand Man, and the Divine Man.

First and highest in man is the human internal, a region of the mind above man's consciousness, and therefore above his control, the Lord's peculiar habitation. To this is analogous in the Grand Man the heaven of human internals, that region nearest to the Lord, consisting of the human internals

of all in the universe, in virtue of which they are under the immediate Divine auspices. Immediately under the human internal is the rational, in the inmost of which humanity commences, because consciousness here begins. This region of the mind is analogous to heaven, and consists of three distinct degrees, answering to the three heavens into which the universal heaven is distinguished. Beneath this is the natural mind, consisting also of three degrees. In an orderly state this mind is in correspondence with the rational or spiritual mind; in a disorderly state it is in opposition to it. From this mind, in its perverted state, exist the three hells, in all opposition to the three heavens. Under these, as their ultimate, is material body.

The Lord, when born a man, had within Him all these elements of humanity. His human internal, different from that of angels and men, was not a receptacle of life, but Life itself. This life was Jehovah Himself or the Father, who was in the Lord, to whom, in his humiliation, He prayed, and with whom, in his state of glorification, He declares his oneness. Under this was the Lord's rational. This was analogous to heaven, being indeed the Divine Truth in heaven, and which was the Divine Human, the Son of God from eternity. But the Lord, in passing through heaven, assumed, with this Divine Truth, the appearances of truth which formed its finite clothing in the minds of angels. In consequence of this, He was capable of being tempted by the angels, and so of bringing the heavens into order.

Besides these, the Lord took the natural mind or external man. And as this mind in man was then in a perverted state and an image of hell, it was into this mind that He admitted temptations from the powers of darkness, by his victories over which He subdued the hells, and so accomplished the work of redemption. Last of all, the Lord had a material body like another man.

To return to the question—What did the Lord assume from the mother? Did He take from the mother nothing but the material organism—the body? True, Swedenborg

states that the Lord took his soul from the Father and his body from the mother. But almost as frequently does He state that the Lord took his internal from the Father, and his external from the mother. There can be no objection to the term organism as applied to that which the Lord took from the mother, since man is nothing but an organ created for the reception of life from the Lord. But the mind has an organism as well as the body, and there can be no reasonable doubt that the Lord took a mental as well as a bodily organism from the Virgin. To the Humanity from the mother, Swedenborg ascribes good and evil inclinations, of which the material body is incapable. What a man inherits from the mother is indeed something external that may be dissipated by regeneration; while that which he derives from his father remains with him to eternity. But if he inherited from his mother only a material organism, its removal would not depend on regeneration. The good and the evil would alike retain it through life, and alike lay it down at death.

If the clothing which the Lord took from the mother was capable of affection and thought, and if affection and thought are nothing else but "the changes and variation of state and form in the organic substances of the *mind*" (*D. P.*, 272), there must have been something mental as well as material in the organism which the Lord took from the Virgin. I agree with Mr. Noble in the statement in his admirable papers on this subject, that this is the external of the natural mind, which he calls the outer natural. The description of the natural mind by Swedenborg answers to this. "The natural mind consists not only of substances of the spiritual world, but also of substances of the natural world; and the substances of the natural world, from their nature, react against the substances of the spiritual world. Hence it is evident that the natural man reacts against the spiritual, and that there is a combat. It is the same thing whether you say the natural and spiritual man, or the natural and spiritual mind" (*D. L. W.*, 260). This covering of the natural mind with the material body, the Lord took from the mother; and it

was in consequence of its mental, and not of its physical organism, that the maternal humanity was capable of the "combat" of temptation.

2. On the second point it is unnecessary to say much. The human was glorified from the inmost of the rational to the outermost of the corporeal. Although the Lord took from the mother nothing but the outer natural and the body, all the other principles of humanity were included in them, and rested upon them. As it was by actual incarnation that the Lord took Humanity upon Him as a distinct essence, the whole process of glorification is the glorification of all He assumed by nativity. To suppose that the Lord took only a material body from the mother, and to consider that the glorification of this was the gradual work which was proceeding during the Lord's life, is to take a very narrow view of the subject. It was the opinion of Mr. Clowes, in which I am not aware that all who hold his general view concur, that the maternal Humanity was not glorified, but put off.

In his note, prefixed to the seventh volume of the *Arcana*, he observes, "If the distinct natures of these various principles, the *maternal*, the *natural*, and the *rational* Humanity of the LORD, be clearly seen, it may also be seen with equal clearness what the Humanity was which He glorified, and what He put off. The Humanity which He glorified or made Divine was the *natural* and *rational* Humanity, whilst the Humanity which He put off, was the *maternal* Humanity, even to the *corporeity* or corporeal principle." From this also he believed that the maternal Humanity contained more than corporeity.

3. We now come to another, and perhaps the most important, point in this discussion—the nature of the process by which the Lord's glorification was effected.

So far as I am aware, there are but two ways by hypothesis, though but one in fact, by which the Glorification of the Lord's Humanity could be effected. It must have been effected either by transmutation or by substitution—by transmuting nature into God, or by substituting God for nature.

A third hypothesis might be adopted. It might be supposed that the glorification was effected partly by transmutation, and partly by substitution. This does not, however, affect the principle of the question.

The first of these hypotheses is met by a clear and positive negative from Swedenborg. "The human nature from the mother was not transmuted into the Divine Essence, neither commixed therewith. Indeed, such transmutation of the human nature into the Divine Essence, or commixion therewith, is impossible" (*D. L.*, 35). So far as authority goes, this is settled. The principle might be confirmed from all the changes that are continually going on both within man and without him in external nature. Man's regeneration is an image of the Lord's Glorification; but although by that work man is born again and becomes a new creature, no part of the process by which he becomes so is effected by the transmutation of one principle or one substance into another. His body is continually undergoing change. He takes substances from the world, and converts them into blood, but the blood derives nothing from the matter but what it contains. No one material substance can be converted into another material substance whose constituent elements are different from its own. The diamond is formed of charcoal and can be reduced to charcoal again; this however is only altering the form without changing the substance.

We come then to the second hypothesis; and this is that which the writings of the church teach, and which all analogy supports. It is a constantly repeated statement of Swedenborg that the Lord's Glorification was effected by putting off the humanity from the mother, and putting on a humanity from the Father. Mr. Mason is aware of the importance of this doctrine. He states "that nothing can be more certain than this, that the whole doctrine of the Lord's Glorification entirely depends for its accuracy upon the construction we put on the words 'put off,' and 'put on.'" All I have been able to learn from the paragraph which contains this is, not what it means, but what it does not mean. "It

must not be understood as meaning rejection, since this is directly opposed to Luke xxiv. 39." This relates only to the Lord's crucified body, but the same principle is applicable to the whole work of glorification.

It appears to me there is but one way in which we can understand the statement of Swedenborg. There must have been an actual substitution of what was Divine for what was merely human.

The Lord glorified his Humanity by a similar process to that by which He regenerates man. By regeneration, man from being natural is made spiritual. This is effected by substitution and by purification; by the substitution of good and truth for evil and falsity, and by purifying the receptacles or recipient vessels into which life from the Lord is received. Regeneration is also a process of development, and is effected by the Lord alone during man's coöperation. Man has to acquire the knowledge of truth and to shun evils as sins; and in proportion as he supplies these outward means, the Lord by an influx of good and truth from within forms him anew. The life which flows in being, however, received into finite and partially purified vessels, is modified accordingly, and man can never become more than a finite and imperfect image of the Lord. By glorification the Lord not only purified the recipient vessels, but made them divine, and in the only way in which that could be done—by substituting the infinite for the finite, so that He was no longer a recipient of life, but life itself.

The remark is sometimes made that there was something in the Lord's Humanity which once was not Divine that was made Divine. This is true. But if it be meant that there was something that was changed into Divinity, the idea is grounded in a misapprehension of the meaning of the term made, which, when employed in relation to any other subject, cannot indicate conversion of one substance into another. In the material world we find instances of animal and vegetable matter being converted into stone; but this, as is well known, is effected on the principle of putting off and putting

on. It is effected simply by the displacement of the particles of the one substance by those of the other. Throughout the physical world, the same principle regulates all such changes, so that nature is full of analogies.

I am not aware that Swedenborg ever employs any comparison to illustrate the nature of the Lord's Glorification but that of man's regeneration. The Lord Himself used a comparison which is alike illustrative of the nature of his own glorification and the regeneration of man. "The hour is come, that the Son of Man should be glorified. Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit" (John xii. 23, 24). This the Lord refers, and this Swedenborg applies, to his approaching final glorification by death and resurrection. But the correspondence is applicable to every particular part, and to the whole of that Divine work. The beauty and force of this comparison will be seen if we consider, that the "corn of wheat" contains in itself all that is produced from it; and that it becomes a stalk of wheat bearing fruit by exerting its own inherent energy and by the development of its own latent parts, which however it can only do when the necessary outward conditions are present. The small mustard-seed contains every part of the future mustard-tree, and the diminutive acorn comprehends in itself the trunk, with every one of the branches and twigs that ever form a part of the future oak. A seed is a tree in first principles. In the seed the tree exists potentially. To bring into ultimates that which exists in first principles,—to make that actual which is only as yet potential, the seed has to fall into the ground and die. There is a part which actually dies, and whose death must take place, that the tree may exist actually as well as potentially; and this very part that dies is reproduced, not indeed in the earth where it decays, but in the new seeds which the plant or the tree produces. Now the Divine seed which the Lord derived from the Father by conception, and which was that Holy Thing that was called the Son of God, contained in

itself all the future humanity; its coverings, analogous to those in which every living seed is enclosed, being taken from the mother. And these coverings, like those of the living seed, being in themselves void of life, were liable to death, and actually died, that the Divine seed might actually live and come into fulness.

It may however be said that the seed, though it contains the different parts of the tree, does not contain the whole substance of the tree. It draws nourishment from without, from the air and from the rain of heaven, and perhaps also from the solid matter of the earth. This is true: and even here the analogy does not fail. For did not the Lord derive nourishment from without? I do not allude to the material nourishment of his material body: I allude to the divine nourishment of his Divine body. In allusion to this the Lord said to the disciples, when they besought Him to eat, "I have meat to eat that ye know not of." And what was the meat of which they were yet ignorant? "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work." This was the meat by which the Lord's Humanity was nourished, and by which it was developed. But this was no human or finite food—it was divine and infinite. His meat was truly the manna that came down from heaven; his drink was truly the dew distilled from the womb of the morning. He breathed a divine atmosphere, He partook of divine food, and thence He became a Divine Man—a Man in ultimates as from eternity He had been in first principles—a Man actually as from everlasting He had been potentially. This truth is declared in the Word, and explained in the writings of the church.

The Word teaches that the Lord came to fulfil the law. Swedenborg states "that the Lord came into the world, that He might fulfil all things contained in the Word, and thereby become Divine Truth or the Word in ultimates." It was therefore by fulfilling all things contained in the Word that He became the Word in ultimates. And "the Lord not only fulfilled all things of the Word in its literal sense,

but also all things in its spiritual sense and in its celestial sense, in which He alone is treated of" (*A. R.*, 820). But not only did the Word which He fulfilled treat of Him, but it was derived from Him, so that whatever He took from the Word He took from Himself. This is clearly stated in the *Arcana*, where we find this passage: "Knowledges derived from that source (the Word) are of such a nature as to be open to the Lord Himself; for the Word itself is derived from the Lord through the heavens, containing in all and every part of it the Lord's life, although it does not appear in its external form. Hence it may be manifest that the Lord in his childhood was not willing to be principled in any other knowledges than those from the Word, which Word was open to Him and extended, as was said, from Jehovah Himself, his Father, with whom He was to be united and become one; and so much the more, because there is nothing said in the Word which, in its inmost contents, has not relation to Him, and *which did not previously come from Him*; for the human essence was only an addition to his Divine essence, which was from eternity" (*A. C.*, 1462).

Every one is his own good and his own truth. So much as any one appropriates of the good and truth of the Word, he becomes a form of good and truth. But any one who should fulfil the Word, would become good itself and truth itself: he would, in short, become the Word itself. This our Lord did, as He alone could do. By fulfilling the whole Word He became the Word itself in ultimates, as from eternity He had been in first principles. In accomplishing this, it was necessary for Him to do what no other man could do. Every one, however highly perfected, and however much he may be a form of good and truth, must for ever remain a finite form, since he receives the descending love and wisdom in finite receptacles; and to him, in consequence, Divine Truth must for ever be clothed with appearances. This was the case with the Lord during his state of instruction; He first acquired knowledge as another man, and was first in the appearances of truth: the appearances of truth continued,

to some extent, with the Lord till his glorification was completed. It was an apparent truth that the Lord uttered on the cross, that the Father had forsaken Him. But the Lord put off all appearances—all receptacles—all forms, which were finite, and put on such as were Divine. Swedenborg speaks indeed of the Lord purifying the recipient vessels as well as making them actually Divine, just, I apprehend, as he speaks of the Lord regenerating as well as glorifying his Humanity, and of his making his Humanity first truth divine and then Divine Truth. But no language can be more clear and decided than that employed by Swedenborg to describe the difference of the Lord's case from that of man, and of the entire removal of everything finite and the substitution of the Infinite in its place. Man, however perfected, is finite; but with the Lord all is infinite: He is Life, and the Fountain of it to angels and men.

4. It remains now to be considered when the Lord's Glorification was completed, and the body made Divine. By the last temptation, which was the passion of the cross, the Lord fully glorified his Humanity and made it Divine. From this repeated statement of the writings, it has been inferred, that the Lord's body was divine when the Lord declared it was finished. It is certain that this was the last temptation, and that by means of it the Lord fully glorified his Humanity and made it Divine. But it is taking the language in a very strict sense indeed to understand it to mean, that at the moment the temptation was ended everything He took from the mother was put off and a Divine body put on. The author of the statement evidently did not so understand it, since in other parts of his writings he assigns to it a later date. Thus he says: "Inasmuch as men rise again after death, therefore the Lord was willing to suffer death and to rise again the third day; but this for the reason that He might put off all the humanity which He derived from the mother, and put on the Divine Humanity; for all the humanity which the Lord took from the mother, He rejected from Himself by temptation; and, lastly, by death, and by

putting on of the Humanity from the Essential Divinity, which was in Him, He glorified Himself, that is, made his Humanity Divine" (*A. E.*, 899). Here it is distinctly stated that the Lord died and rose that He might put off the infirm and put on the Divine Humanity. He speaks of the rejection of the maternal humanity as necessary to the putting on of the Divine Humanity. The death of the one was necessary to the existence in ultimates of the other. The rejection of the maternal humanity is said to have been completed by its death. Yet even this does not appear to be meant by its author in its strictest sense, since he extends the period of the complete rejection of the maternal humanity beyond that of its death. Thus, in the *Divine Love and Wisdom* (16), "His being buried signified the rejection of the residue of the humanity taken from the mother, and his rising again the third day signified his glorification." This statement is repeated with a slight addition in his last work.

Let us now, in relation to this particular, compare the regeneration and resurrection of man with the glorification and resurrection of the Lord.

Between the Lord's Glorification, as understood by Mr. Mason, and the regeneration of man, there is no parallelism; indeed the parallelism is completely destroyed. Regeneration is a progressive work during the whole course of his life. Supposing man during his life in the world to be regenerated so as to become after death an angel of the highest heaven, his regeneration has been that of his mind,—he is regenerated as to all the degrees of his life, from the lowest to the highest, but during all this perfecting process his material body has remained the same. It may have been purified and refined, but it is still matter and nothing but matter. When he is to be removed to his home in heaven he dies, and on the third day he rises from the dead, not by the resurrection of his body, but by the separation of his soul from it.

Compare this with the Lord's Glorification. According to Mr. Mason's theory, it is the Lord's body itself which

during his whole life undergoes the process of glorification. Its substance undergoes a gradual but complete change. It not only becomes refined matter, but it becomes divine matter. On the cross this process of bodily transformation is completed. At, or soon after the moment that the whole body has become life itself, it dies, it is buried, and it lies in the tomb till the third day; it then rises in the same state and of the same substance as it was when laid in the sepulchre; but from what cause or for what end this death and burial take place, no one can tell. Take the other view. The Lord glorified his Humanity, as he regenerates man, by glorifying his mind, natural and rational. During the whole of this process his body continued to be material. The period comes that the Lord is to return to the Father. His removal is to be effected, not by a natural, but by a violent death. All hell conspires to make a last grand effort to defeat his glorious purpose of accomplishing the redemption of the human race. The powers of the world combine with the powers of hell. The Lord is taken, condemned, and nailed to the cross. And now comes his last fearful temptation. In that direful conflict he feels all the horrors of despair, and utters the awful cry, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" But in that direful conflict He overcomes all the powers of darkness. With that final victory over hell every fallen principle He inherited from the mother is expelled; but in this conflict the Humanity itself dies. By the passion of the cross the glorification of his Humanity as to all its mental principles is completed. He had lived as a man, and He dies as a man: like a man He is laid in the grave; and like a man He rose from the dead the third day. But here the parallel ceases. Unlike all other men, He glorified the sensual and corporeal principles of human nature. His resurrection was not therefore effected by his spirit being separated from the body; He rises with the body completely glorified and made Divine. And here we come to see why the Lord should actually die and actually rise from the dead. The reason is grounded in an invariable and even

immutable law: the old man must die that the new man may live: the maternal corporeity must actually pass through death, that the divine corporeity may come into actual life, and become the divine body of Jehovah God. But according to the other theory, it was not the maternal but the paternal corporeity that died; it was not the infirm humanity but the divine humanity that expired. According to this view the son of Mary never died in the literal sense at all: it was not the son of Mary that died on the cross, it was the Son of God: it was not the old man that died, it was the new man. Thus, instead of the Lord's Glorification being the perfection of all order, it was in this respect the reversal of order. For that the death of the body should precede its deification, is only consistent with the order which is observed in the regeneration of man.

The material body is not by itself the corporeal part of human nature. Of this part of man's nature, sensation is the principal, and the corporeal is the instrumental. Now as it is the spirit which sees, speaks, and feels in the body, sensation belongs to the spirit, and is something spiritual; therefore when the body is deprived of its senses, it dies and becomes a carcase (*A. C.*, 5077). Death does not deprive the body of the organs of sense, but of sense itself. But even this is viewing the corporeal principle simply as it is in itself, distinct from any intellectual or moral character. It exists in this state only with infants. The sensual and corporeal principles include all the ideas and cupidities that are connected with them. There are therefore sensual and corporeal spirits as well as sensual and corporeal men.

Those who believe nothing but what they see are sensual, those who believe nothing but what they feel are corporeal. The disciples were still under the influence of the sensual principle when they required to see the Lord with His wounds in order to believe, and Thomas was still under the influence of the corporeal principle when he required, not only to see but to feel them. And that transaction, while it convinced them, represented that now the Lord's love and truth can

reach, immediately from Himself, those who are sensual and corporeal. This is the intellectual form which this state assumes. But it has a moral or voluntary character besides; and this consists in living in the pleasures of the body. It is from the sensual and corporeal principles in this state that temptation arises. Against this state our Lord fought; and it was the last which He overcame. For if the lowest of the external man is opposite to the highest of the internal, and if regeneration ascends and descends by corresponding degrees, the highest and the lowest are the last regenerated. So also with the Lord. His body itself could not therefore be made Divine till the evil of the sensual and corporeal principles were extinguished by overcoming hells, which acted upon them. The Lord could not put off the corporeal substance till He put off the corporeal loves, which constituted their corporeal life; that is, the maternal life in the corporeal principle. It is but natural that the extinction of this life should result in the death of the material body, as it was necessary that this body, in agreement with the laws of regeneration, should actually die, before the divine body could be put on. The analogy between the ease of the Lord and that of man is stated in the writings: "Man must die as to the body and also as to his proprium in order that he may rise again; for unless both the former and the latter die, he cannot have the life of heaven. Inasmuch as men rise again after death, therefore the Lord was willing to suffer death and rise again the third day" (*A. E.*, 899).

The whole argument for the divinity of the Lord's crucified body rests on the construction put upon the Lord's declaration that He, unlike a spirit, had flesh and bones; and on the frequent statement in the writings of the church, that the Lord rose with his whole body complete, and left nothing in the sepulchre. The appearance of wounds which the Lord's risen body exhibited as proof that He was not a spirit, has already been considered. It now remains to speak of the statement in the writings.

When the author states that the Lord rose with his whole

body complete, Mr. Mason understands it to mean that his resurrection body was the very same substance as his crucified body. What those on the other side understand is this, that the Lord's rising with his whole body complete, means that He rose with a complete body; that in Him humanity was completely ultimated, even to the flesh and bones. The Lord's resurrection body and that which He had previously were the same in degree, but not in substance. The question is, which of these constructions put upon the statement of the author is the most reasonable and consistent. Those who understand it to mean that the very same substance was raised that was laid in the grave, are of course tied up to the conclusion that the Lord's body was as completely divine before as after it was buried. But as that body, before it was entombed, was subject to the laws of nature, having gravity and size, and being seen and handled by material eyes and hands, those who maintain that even then it was divine, have found themselves compelled to invest it with material attributes, notwithstanding the immateriality of its substance. This is evidently a pure invention, for it has no ground in Scripture, reason, or science, but is alike abhorrent to them all.

Take the other view. The Lord arose with whole body complete, in the sense of rising with a complete human body, the difference being, that the one body was material and the other Divine. Still it may be contended that this could not be the same body that was crucified. We answer, it was the same in the sense of the author, and in the sense that is consistent with any and with all the circumstances of the case. It may seem at first sight that the humanity put off could not be the same as the humanity put on. Yet are we constantly told that the Lord glorified his Humanity and made it Divine. If it be insisted that *his* and *it* must mean identity, then must we believe that the very same substance was converted into Divinity. But while the author constantly states the Lord glorified humanity, or made it Divine, he as constantly and emphatically states that he glorified it by putting

off all the humanity he had from the mother and putting on a humanity derived from the Father, so that He was no longer the Son of Mary, but purely the Son of God. In one instance, at least, the author speaks of that which was put off and that which was glorified as the same, a passage which greatly embarrassed Mr. Clowes. In the *Arcana* (2159) he says, "The Humanity appertaining to the Lord, before He put it off *and* made it Divine, was nothing else but a servant." Now it may be evident that the author had before his mind the idea of Humanity distinct from the idea of substance. He could not mean that that which was put off was made Divine, for this is opposed to his own teaching, and would make no sense; but he meant that Humanity itself was made Divine by putting off what was from the mother, and putting on what was from the Father.

Mr. Mason in his pamphlet accuses those who consider that the matter of the Lord's body was put off in the sepulchre, as in effect, believing that the Lord has not the real ultimate of Humanity at all. Let us for a moment compare these views in this respect. I believe, and I hope many believe with me, that the Word was made flesh; our friend only believes that flesh was made the Word. I do not mean that he asserts this; I only mean that his principles involve the idea. I believe that the eternal Word not only assumed the ultimates of Humanity, but that it became itself Humanity in ultimates. It assumed Humanity in the womb of the Virgin, and made that Humanity Divine by putting off everything of Mary, and putting or putting forth a Divine Humanity itself. I therefore believe that the Word was actually made flesh; that is, made human. Our friend believes that the Humanity was made Divine, but in a way that excludes the idea that the Word in first principles was made the Word in ultimates. Now, which view presents to the mind the idea of greatest fulness, perfection, and power? Can anything be conceived more complete than the Word in its completeness—the Word itself actually human—actually in the place of the material body inherited from the mother?

Our friend is of opinion that the feebleness of our Church and the little progress it makes is owing to the want of a right acknowledgment of the truth on this subject, as he understands it. To me it appears that the profession and prevalence of his doctrine is calculated to aggravate the defect which he laments. What tendency such a doctrine has either to unity or power amongst ourselves, does not appear to me. What it has to recommend the principles of the church to others is still less obvious. To me it seems that the direct tendency of such an idea is to repel rather than to attract. Tell any person of reason and common sense that the mangled, bleeding, dead body of the Saviour was yet Divine and Life itself, and he will regard you as a jester or a lunatic. And if he becomes satisfied that you are sane and serious, he will treat your doctrine and, through it, your whole theological system with contempt or ridicule.

Mr. Mason talks much of giving due force to the literal sense of Scripture. What is there in the literal sense of the narrative that could lead any one, who had no foregone conclusion on the subject, to believe that the Lord's crucified body was even immaterial? Not so with respect to the Lord's risen body. Every person possessed of understanding can be made to see, if he is willing to see, that the Lord's risen body must have been immaterial, and this is the first step to the perception that it was Divine. A body that could instantly appear in the midst of the assembled apostles when the door was shut, and which could vanish out of sight in an instant, every one may see could not be material.

Is it one of the means of the power of New Church truth that it can be rationally expounded, even separately from the testimony of revelation? There is then no difficulty in concluding which of these views is the most likely to satisfy the reason, both of those within and of those without the church.

I have not entered into the question of what became of the matter of the Lord's body. Although I have spoken in support of the view taken by those whom Mr. Mason calls

dissipationists, I do not bind myself to that or to any particular theory on the subject. I bind myself to this, and to this only : The Lord's body was material when it was laid in the tomb ; it was immaterial—Divine, when raised from the dead. It was made Divine by putting off whatever remained of the humanity from the mother, and putting on a Divine Humanity from the Father.

Of the Lord's Humanity it may be said, it was sown a material body, it was raised a divine body ;

“ And when the Son of Mary died,
The Son of God arose.”

When I formed the resolution of making some Strictures on Mr. Mason's *Earnest Address*, it was rather against the object of the author, or the manifest tendency of his measures, than against his particular view, that I intended to protest. Against Mr. Mason, personally, I religiously trust I have neither anger nor enmity. As a conscientious believer in, and an earnest advocate of, his particular theory, I can love and respect him as a brother—though an erring one ; but as an agitator, the tendency of whose measures is to array the members of the church in two hostile factions against each other on a point which does not constitute an essential of their faith, I can regard him only as a troubler of Israel. Let the members of the church, then, both in this country and America, as they value their ecclesiastical liberty, their free and happy intercourse and intercommunion, hitherto undisturbed by conscientious difference of opinion on secondary truths, resist this attempt to lay a yoke upon their necks which no independent man, or body of men, can bear.



